

Ground-wave Analysis Model for MF Broadcast Systems

N. DeMinco



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Malcolm Baldrige, Secretary

Alfred C. Sikes, Assistant Secretary
for Communications and Information

September 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	vii
Abstract	1
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
2. THE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE PREDICTION PROGRAM GWVOA	3
2.1 The System Interface Algorithm	4
2.2 The Propagation Loss Prediction Methods	7
2.2.1 The Smooth-Earth Method	7
2.2.2 The Smooth-Earth, Mixed-Path Method	10
2.2.3 The Irregular-Earth, Mixed-Path Method	13
2.3 The Noise Prediction Algorithm	15
2.4 The Antenna Algorithm	18
2.5 The Run Time and Accuracy Algorithms	26
2.5.1 Time and Accuracy Tradeoffs	26
2.5.2 Terrain and Frequency Effects on Accuracy	27
3. A USER'S GUIDE TO PROGRAM GWVOA	41
4. SAMPLE SESSIONS WITH PROGRAM GWVOA	58
5. CONCLUSIONS	90
6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT	90
7. REFERENCES	91

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	A three-section, mixed-path for the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method.	11
2.	Three-monopole array geometry.	23
3.	Four-monopole array geometry.	24
4.	Six-monopole array geometry.	25
5.	Path profile for Canyonlands, Utah (rough terrain).	29
6.	Path profile for Santa Rita Mountains, Arizona (hilly terrain).	30
7.	Propagation loss predictions for the irregular-Earth method using 1 and 8 km terrain data spacing at .52 MHz over rough terrain.	31
8.	Propagation loss predictions for the irregular-Earth method using 1 and 8 km terrain data spacing at 1.00 MHz over rough terrain.	31
9.	Propagation loss predictions for the irregular-Earth method using 1 and 8 km terrain data spacing at 1.62 MHz over rough terrain.	32
10.	Propagation loss predictions for the irregular-Earth method using 1 and 8 km terrain data spacing at .52 MHz over hilly terrain.	32
11.	Propagation loss predictions for the irregular-Earth method using 1 and 8 km terrain data spacing at 1.62 MHz over hilly terrain.	33
12.	Propagation loss predictions for the irregular-Earth method using 1 and 8 km terrain data spacing at 1.62 MHz over hilly terrain.	33
13.	Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 1 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth method at .52 MHz over rough terrain.	35

<u>List of Figures (cont.)</u>	<u>Page</u>
14. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 8 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth method at .52 MHz over rough terrain.	35
15. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 1 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth method at 1.00 MHz over rough terrain.	36
16. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 8 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth method at 1.00 MHz over rough terrain.	35
17. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 1 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth method at 1.62 MHz over rough terrain.	37
18. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 8 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth method at 1.62 MHz over rough terrain.	37
19. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 1 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method at .52 MHz over hilly terrain.	38
20. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 8 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method at .52 MHz over hilly terrain.	38
21. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 1 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method at 1.00 MHz over hilly terrain.	39
22. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 8-km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method at 1.00 MHz over hilly terrain.	39

<u>List of Figures (cont.)</u>	<u>Page</u>
23. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 1 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method at 1.62 MHz over hilly terrain.	40
24. Propagation loss prediction comparison for the irregular-Earth method using 8 - km terrain spacing versus the smooth-Earth, mixed-path method at 1.62 MHz over hilly terrain.	40

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Coefficients for Man-made Noise and Galactic Noise.	17
2.	Signal-to-Noise Power Ratio and Achievable-Distance Prediction Questions, Their Meaning and Acceptable Range of Values.	43